Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VI, NO. 40, *Issue Number* 297, OCTOBER 5, 1949 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

OCT 11 1949

RUSSIA'S ATOMIC EXPLOSION

by Bonner Fellers

The President's announcement of an atomic explosion in Russia brings his European Military Assistance Program into sharp focus.

Even the strongest supporters of that program must admit now that there is no sound basis for the assumption that, in war, the French frontiers will receive the first shock from the Red Forces. It may well be that Washington, D. C., and our key industrial centers will be the objectives of the initial atomic assault. Moreover, Red agents in America have not been idle during the past 16 years and if war comes we must expect sabotage of our war industry to accompany atomic bombing. Terrific devastation will result unless we make every possible effective preparation against it.

The atomic explosion in Russia makes it imperative that America gain and maintain mastery of the air. Russia has her own version of the B-29. It may not have round-trip intercontinental ranges, but Soviet bombs would have a good one way ticket. Or, as the Soviet Red Star puts it, "there are just as many kilometers from Philadelphia to Moscow as from Moscow to Philadelphia". If, in war, we are unable to control the skies above us, Russia with the atomic bomb could destroy us. On the other hand, our atomic bombs have no value if we do not have an Air Force sufficiently powerful to deliver them. If war comes, mastery of the air is essential for our security as well as for victory. Russia's atomic explosion has made it essential that we build it now.

A country which can turn out six million motor units annually can certainly out-build the Soviet Union in aircraft without undue interference with our peacetime economy. Air supremacy and other necessary security measures can be achieved for some two or three billion dollars less than our present budget if we avoid lavish expenditures for Allied assistance and for our Army and Navy which, against Russia, would be simply supporting arms for the Air Force. Hand in hand with this military program, we must establish radar screens to detect approaching enemy aircraft. And, what is even more important, we must stimulate, extend, and improve our intelligence agencies so that we may anticipate the intent of our potential enemy. Radar would give us an hour's warning; intelligence might sound the alert months before an attack.

Copyright 1949 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The atomic explosion in Russia accentuates the futility of the President's Military Assistance Program for Europe. It would be criminal if we were to repeat the natural mistake which the French made in World War II. After the mass slaughter of the first World War, French leaders resolved never again to try to hold their frontier with human beings. They built a Maginot Line of steel. But, in concept, it was one war too late.

Today, France again desperately strives to defend her borders. This time it is not to be a static defense of the Maginot type. The plan provides a balanced, highly mobile striking force of tanks and self-propelled artillery and infantry in trucks, all supported by tactical aircraft. It will be poised to strike only if Stalin moves.

Actually, the Allied collective defensive forces, as now projected, are but the Maginot Line of World War II, on wheels. This new force would be more expensive than the static type because it is costly to motorize a Maginot Line. Against our mobile European frontier forces, Stalin could hurl a thousand Red Divisions. In addition to being outnumbered 10 or 20 to one on the ground, our frontier forces would be subject to attack from the 16,000 combat planes the Red Air Force is believed to possess.

After the Red Air Force cleared the air above our Maginot Line on wheels, the latter's mobility in relation to air power would be as nothing. To Red airmen, it would appear to crawl like a worm, and, characterized by enormous ponderosity, it would be the easy prey of Russia's lightning jet-cavalry of the sky. Military authorities are in general agreement that the Allied line could not prevent a rapid Red occupation of Western Europe.

This proposed Maginot Line on wheels would give us a false sense of security during peacetime. It would be two wars behind sound military concepts. It offers no real threat to Stalin's security; it interposes no barrier of consequence to his occupation of Western Europe. It would only serve Stalin's purpose.

Our Government would do well to advise our Allies that this $1.3 billion expenditure is the first and final installment for ground combat equipment in Europe. We should suggest that the weapons be used for interior security rather than the initial increment for garrison forces to hold the Red Army east of the Rhine. Meanwhile, they could complete their recovery from the last war's devastation and devote their energies to defeating Communists' political encroachment. If we will build the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

best Air Force in the world, and call upon our Allies to assist with men and planes and air bases which can be defended, Russia can probably be contained within her borders.

III

The Administration's Military Assistance Program will serve to incite rather than deter war. It is time our leaders gave serious consideration to the psychological reactions of this ill-advised measure. We may cry to heaven that our defensive forces on the Rhine are to keep the peace, but the Kremlin can logically claim that capitalistic armed might is being amassed to destroy Russia.

How would the Russian people respond to such a claim? The Russians are living under what amounts to a military occupation. Some 10 to 15 million political prisoners are working as slave labor, slowly dying of starvation. Closely checking on the population and keeping it subservient to the system are 2 million armed police. Even so, there have been recent occasions when the police had to call on the Red Army to help subdue anti-Communist demonstrations. Meanwhile, the Kremlin has 500,000 full-time paid Communist propagandists to extol the virtues of the system to the people. Yet another half million Russians have escaped into Europe because of their anti-Communist views.

The above picture of internal division might well be changed overnight. Kremlin leaders need a unifying agency to distract their people from their sad plight and prevent increased internal dislocation. They merely have to acquaint their people with our Administration's Military Assistance Program to convince them that the Western Powers seek to destroy Russia. Guns on the Rhine -- especially American guns pointing East -- offer the necessary unifying catalyst.

IV

Although history is replete with the failure of nations to keep the peace by force, we have chosen a peace program today which relies principally on military might. The belief that might makes right is un-Christian. Peace can stem only from things of the spirit.

America possesses a golden opportunity to launch a psychological program against Russia. We should mount a full-scale psychological campaign addressed to the Russian people and directed against the Kremlin Military Clique. From among the 500,000 Russian refugees and Red Army deserters now in Europe, we can select volunteer planners and operators who will penetrate the Iron Curtain and carry our great weapon -- truth -- to the Russian people. A number of techniques have been worked out by our intelligence agencies and with the help of Russian refugees we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

know the Iron Curtain can be penetrated. Many would risk their lives to emancipate their enslaved people. These Russian escapees might well start a great movement for a liberal government in Moscow. Stalin then would have to turn aside from foreign military and political expansion and seek to put his own house in order.

Why not enlist, in this work, the services of the American Federation of Labor to transmit a message of freedom from American labor to the workers and peasants of Russia? Could not the churches, all denominations, collaborate in this work to send, via the mechanism of penetration, their message to the unfortunate Russians, who are starved for things of the spirit?

The psychological job cannot be effectively done by the State Department's Voice of America, which must always conform to diplomatic policy. The campaign must be shaped so as to present the talent and genius and the spiritual virtues of our people in a compelling appeal to the Russians.

From my own experience under General MacArthur as officer in charge of psychological warfare against Japan, this proposal is neither visionary nor impractical. Similar techniques worked out in our program against Japan met with amazing success. This is what they helped to accomplish: (1) turned the Japanese population against their own Militarists; and (2) gave the Emperor assurance that his people would support him in demanding that his Militarists surrender.

At the very time when we were destroying them by bombing, psychological warfare changed the minds of the Japanese who had been indoctrinated to hate us. Why, then, can't a similar campaign of truth dissemination, in peace, influence the Russians -- who, from my observation in Russia, already like us -- to demand a liberal government? In the cause of world peace this campaign should be attempted.

This psychological program is absolutely essential. But the time has not yet come when we can depend upon it alone. While we appeal to the Russians, we must at the same time build the best Air Force in the world. Russia's atomic explosion has narrowed the time factor. For our own security and for keeping the peace both programs must start now.

Brigadier General Bonner Fellers (ret'd), West Point 1918, DSM with oak leaf cluster, was Military Observer with the British in Africa (1940-42) and on General MacArthur's staff as a Ground Officer (1943-46).

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VI, No. 40

By Frank C. Hanighen October 5, 1949

STEEL STRIKE: The steel strike, popularly represented as "Labor vs. Steel Industry" is fundamentally something much bigger. It is in reality a round, and a key round, in the developing struggle by the entrenched political oligarchy to establish full State control of industry and labor. It is Big Government vs. Capitalism. Time was when labor unions fought Big Business for improvement in wages and hours, and the tides of battle depended largely upon the courage and shrewdness of labor leaders and the militancy of the rank and file. The Federal Government maintained neutrality towards the disputes. But for the last 14 years organized Labor, particularly the CIO, has learned to shelter itself in the lee of Big Government. The only Labor leader of the old type is John L. Lewis. Mr. Philip Murray is almost pathetically dependent on the grace of Big Government, which contrives to be "neutral against" the employers. Even the rivalry between Murray and Reuther for control of the CIO is not what it seems; it is no rank-and-file dynamism pushing forward one or the other Labor leader. Reuther is simply competing with Murray for the position of chief Labor lackey to the White House. It is incorrect to speak of "monopoly unionism". The "monopoly" which is often mentioned currently actually is State monopoly, of which unions are a sort of subsidiary.

In the present steel strike, Big Government holds most of the cards -- although the White House does fear a general relapse in business as a result of strikes too long protracted. Big Government, through its "fact finding" board, was "neutral against" the companies. It pushed Labor into a better but not decisive position by its findings. Today, it holds in reserve its "secret weapon" for the psychological moment. Privately, steel management is apprehensive of the possibility of seizure of plants. Although little has been mentioned in the press about this, management has not forgotten that Federal Mediator Cyrus Ching brandished this weapon at one of the secret negotiations. Ching also hinted that the Chief Executive might go to the Hill and ask for special legislation to deal with the situation. It is recalled that early in this session the President talked of the Government going into the steel business.

The struggle now carried on by the Executive arm of the Government, professedly in behalf of the workers, is actually directed against Capital rather than against Management. It has been noticed that companies which do not need the capital market (such as Ford) are more prone to make settlements, on the pension issue, on a non-contributory basis, than those which need flotations offered to the capital market. Capital knows that yielding on noncontributory benefits now will mean more and more demands and higher and higher increases later in these benefits. As a result smaller funds will be available to stockholders, and the capital investment market will be adversely affected. Then, Big Government will enter the scene, doubtless blaming the "strike of capital", and will introduce Government investment in and direct control of private industry, with steel as the first victim. The process towards the monolithic totalitarian State under Big Government will be far advanced. It is better to recognize the real issues, the real struggle and trend behind the steel strike rather than to portray -- as do some silly commentators -- the struggle in terms of a prize fight between "Little Phil" Murray and "Big Ben" Fairless.

* * * * *

PARTY POLITICS: The Democratic High Command is taking a pretty rosy view of the Party's prospects in the '50 elections. They expect to win both houses, although they concede loss of some key Senate seats. For instance, they say that both Demo-

Copyright 1949 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic Senators Francis Meyers of Pennsylvania and Scott Lucas of Illinois are doomed. On the subject of Taft, in Ohio, they have their fingers crossed. They believe Lehmann will win in New York this November -- if they can keep Mrs. Roosevelt quiet. They fear that a vocal Eleanor during the next month would stir up Roman Catholic animosity, and help Dulles. The Democratic estimate on this contest may well be right. For the best private Republican opinion on the Dulles-Lehman campaign is that odds are 6 to 5 on Lehmann. Dulles is making a brave scrap, and saying many sound things. But he was the wrong choice -- the popular Lieutenant Governor Joe Hanley would have been a much stronger candidate.

White House caution about the outcome of the Taft campaign has reason. Last week the Senator scored a success when he talked to the assembled board of the powerful Farm Bureau of Ohio. Members liked him and his ideas. They liked him even more the next day, when they heard representatives of the CIO and AFL. These Labor delegates ranted so extravagantly against Taft that they turned even the most "liberal" members of the Farm Bureau board against them. This particular incident is a setback to White House hopes that Murray Lincoln, President of the Ohio Farm Bureau, will seek the nomination to run against Taft. There is strong opposition to Lincoln in the Democratic Ohio organization, and Lincoln has been hesitating. The sentiment of his own board may influence him not to make the race.

The Taft story is one of few optimistic notes in the GOP picture. On Capitol Hill, Republican morale is very bad. One hears frequent assertions that this or that Republican Congressman is discouraged and does not intend to run again next year. The fact is that the Party has not obtained any significant funds from the faithful. Last winter and spring, the money bags did not open, it was said, because the old line regulars did not like Dewey and the "me too" trend. But the election of Gabrielson, supposedly the man of the regulars, has not apparently altered the financial situation. They still won't write checks. Now the reason given is that the GOP has no positive, fighting program. It remains for some big figure in the Party to galvanize it into action.

* * * * *

REPUBLICAN FARM CONFERENCE: The recent GOP Farm Conference held in Sioux City, Iowa, illustrates the Party's lack of a program, or any inspiration to produce one. For some time previous to the scheduled date, some members of the National Committee urged that it be cancelled. They said that since the Committee had no definite proposal for solution of the farm problem, it would be better to hold no conference at the present time; that a colorless, fruitless show would prove to be a detriment. Chairman Gabrielson at first reportedly took this view, but finally decided that preparations had gone so far that it could not be avoided. So, on September 23, the politicians began to drone through their canned speeches in Sioux City.

But a miracle salvaged something out of the wreckage. After some hours of tedious political oratory, a farmer rushed to the rostrum and demanded that "real dirt farmers" be heard. The Committee leaders had the wit to capitalize on this, and during the following 24 hours some 100 "real dirt farmers" addressed the gathering. According to a good observer present, they gave color and action and at least made the meeting a farm affair. One farm orator yelled, "There's one commandment which says 'Thou shalt not steal' and that is what you are violating when you take money from the Federal treasury to pay any group." We suspect that many of the vocal farmers were old-time GOP stalwarts, but at any rate they represented one genuine farm point of view. We gather that the general trend was critical of the Brannan Plan. A large majority present seemed to favor a flexible price support program, more like the 75-90 per cent parity of the Anderson bill (this week before Congress) than the 60-90 per cent flexible pattern of the Hope-Aiken bill. But that was hardly encouraging from the Party standpoint, for the Anderson bill is a Democratic Administration measure. The meeting adjourned with the National Committee

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promising to sift the various proposals made by the farmer delegates and to report by spring. The Sioux City gathering did nothing to make the GOP acceptable to the agricultural community, but it could have been worse.

* * * * *

LILIENTHAL: Yesterday, Senators rebuffed the President by refusing to recommend confirmation of Leland Olds of the FTC. The Commerce subcommittee vote, resounding as a slap in the face, was 7 to 0. In the wake of this event, observers are wondering if more such examples of Senatorial independence are due, and -- in particular -- if even that Presidential favorite, David Lilienthal, is threatened. Lilienthal's reappointment comes up before the Senate early in the next session of Congress. It is reported that the members of the atomic subcommittee are almost as solidly opposed to Lilienthal as the Commerce subcommittee was opposed to Olds. Such Democratic leaders as Johnson of Colorado and Russell of Georgia are said to distrust the head of the Atomic Commission. But the factor which might well kill Lilienthal's chances is the rising ambition of Senator Brien McMahon. The Connecticut Democrat has tasted a good deal of palatable public attention as a result of his activities as head of the Senate Atomic Committee. Like Lilienthal himself, McMahon has been obtaining quite a few lecture engagements. It is believed that the Senator would now like to have the spotlight all to himself, and -- while formally defending Lilienthal -- privately would not be averse to retiring the latter to private life. Such motives, such maneuvers are not exactly unknown on Capitol Hill.

* * * * *

VILLARD: We observe that a number of obituary writers stress "pacifism" as the most notable trait of the career of the late Osward Garrison Villard, who passed away last week. To our way of thinking such an interpretation misses the mark. "OGV", as many of us called him, was probably the last of the great liberal publicists. In his heyday during World War I and in the Twenties, his overflowing humanitarianism ranged him on the side of the workers and farmers as against the then often arrogant tycoons of business. But early in the New Deal Villard perceived the looming dangers of statism to our Constitution and republican system of checks and balances. He attacked and exposed arrogant Labor racketeers and monopolies. He opposed the court-packing scheme in 1937. He dwelt on the evil effects of the New Deal administration of the income tax.

He became a crusader, this time, against "the totalitarian liberals". But those who knew him realized how saddened he was by the fact that journals which he had formerly made truly liberal had now, under new managements, become "totalitarian liberal". It is true that he was a pacifist, but one might dispute the implication of some of his newspaper biographers that "pure pacifism" was the only motive behind this stand. A good case could be made out that his realization of the cost of war to the foundations of the Republic was as much a spur to his pacifism as his humanitarianism. In any case, we shall remember our friend (who was also a valued contributor to HUMAN EVENTS) as a great publicist, a great liberal and a great man.

* * * * *

CRIPPS: Winston Churchill's mot about tall, solemn Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer -- "there but for the grace of God goes God" -- is a little timeworn. But the wags in Fleet Street confected another in recent weeks. The Daily Mail leader writer (September 28) wrote: "One London newspaper yesterday called Sir Stafford the Iron Chancellor. The description is wrong. His speech in the House once again showed him like Bismarck as a 'lath painted to look like iron'." Needless to say the Daily Mail is a Conservative paper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

The Theory of Education in the United States, by Albert Jay Nock. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $2.25. Reviewed by Frank Chodorov.

A machine always in need of repair must be unsound in principle. That, at least, is a layman's conclusion. In like reasoning, when we observe how for over a half century the professionals in education have tinkered with pedagogical methods and with curricula, we are inclined to ask about the underlying theory. Maybe the theory is inconsistent with what we expect of our educational machine; maybe we should not expect more than we bargained for.

This was the thesis Albert Jay Nock set out to discuss in his lectures at the University of Virginia in 1931, later published as The Theory of Education in the United States. Since then the word battle between educational leaders has waxed wordier than ever, curricula have undergone major operations with frightening rapidity and tinkering with methods has become routine with school management. Evidently, the underlying theory of education is still in need of critical examination, and Nock's comments on the subject are just as timely now as they were in 1931.

Our theory of education springs from a very strong and universal parental passion: that the portals of the good life shall be opened wider for the new generation than they were for the last. Out of this laudable impulse come three principles: First, that all children are equal in educational capacity; Second, that under democracy they are equally entitled to education; Third, that a literate citizenry is prerequisite for good public order and an honest government. Putting aside the generating parental impulse, which is in the nature of things and cannot be questioned, Nock applies himself to the three principles of our theory.

That all men are equally educable is as untrue as that all men are six feet tall. Each of us, in his conscience, recognizes his own limitations, and all experience testifies to variations in mental capacities. Our first principle is untenable. That admission casts doubt on the second principle, that democracy is under obligation to provide equal educational opportunities. Recognition of differences in innate capacities would necessitate the establishment of schools for various mentalities, thus accentuating the differences -- and that would hardly do. In the circumstances, only the "average" can be considered, which amounts to neglect of both the gifted and the marginal minds. The third principle, that education is a patriotic value, implies the gearing of education to the "average" capacity; this, in practice, turns out to be an ability to master the three R's.

Our theory of education, then, is at odds with the Great Tradition, in which the standard was set as high as the best scholarship could set it; those who could make it did so, and those who were not up to the task did something else. When the equalitarian wave reached its crest, in the latter part of the last century, the final vestiges of the Great Tradition had to be abandoned; our theory required it. Which is as it should be. But, by a perversity of logic, we have clung to the forms and nomenclature (and aspirations) of the Great Tradition while giving up its substance; that is the fault of our educational managers. We must recognize the fact that our theory is inconsistent with the Great Tradition, that it does not permit of education in that sense at all; in fact, given such a theory, the best our schools can offer, as they do, is training in the arts and sciences, toward the end that we can all make a better living.

In the light of the latest reformation in our system, under the "G.I. Bill of Rights", the re-issuance of this little book is most opportune. Nock's thesis is confirmed by the law, which holds that the veteran is entitled to the training opportunities offered by schools of "higher" learning, so that he may the better get on. What Nock objects to is calling this sort of thing "education".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED